REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests

reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is

fully responsive to all issues raised in the Office Action mailed January18, 2006.

5

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,538,669 to Lagueux, et al. (hereinafter, "the '669 patent").

10   Applicants traverse this rejection.

The '669 patent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) independent claim

1 because the '669 patent neither discloses (nor even suggests) limitations

explicitly recited in independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites "a virtualized logical

disk object representing a virtual storage container, wherein the virtualized

15   logical disk is an abstract representation of physical storage capacity provided

by plurality of physical stores." The Action appears to assert that the LUN

described in the '669 patent discloses this limitation, and cites column 7,

column 8, lines 25-35, and column 17 to support the assertion.

Claim 1 further recites *as a separate element* "a virtual disk object

20   representing a virtual storage container, wherein the virtual disk object is an

abstract representation of one or more virtualized logical disk objects, the virtual

disk object including an exposed management interface." The Action asserts

that the '669 patent discloses this limitation, and generally cites column 2 and

column 7 to support the rejection. The Action appears to assert that the LUN

described in the '669 patent satisfies both limitations. Applicant disagrees.

Nothing in this text discloses (or even suggests) a virtual disk object *that is*

separate from a virtualized logical disk object, wherein the virtual disk object is

5   an abstract representation of one or more virtualized logical disk objects, the

virtual disk object including an exposed management interface, as recited in

claim 1. Therefore, the '669 patent cannot anticipate independent claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1, and are allowable at least

by virtue of their dependency.

10

Claims 9-16

The '669 patent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) independent claim

9 because the '669 patent neither discloses (nor even suggests) limitations

explicitly recited in independent claim 9. Among other limitations, claim 9

15   recites "specifying at least some of the plurality of physical disk drives for

inclusion in a storage cell." The Action asserts that the '669 patent discloses

this limitation, and cites column 15, lines 20-45 to support the assertion.

Applicants disagree. The cited text reads as follows:

20   In the example illustrated in FIG. 12, the external
interface is provided by the NIC #0, and its associated
HDM is represented by block 1010. The protocol translator
is provided by the SCSI target server ISM 1011. A cache
function is provided by the ISM 1012. A mirror function is
provided by the ISM 1013. The storage objects are
25   accessed from the mirror function 1013, and consist of a
set of physical storage interfaces selected in this example
from the fiber channel basic daisy chain interface and its
associated HDM represented by block 1014 or an external
LUN interface, the disk drives in the fiber channel arbitrated
30   loop accessed through the ISM/HDM pair represented by
block 1015 and the redundant block 1016, the solid state

5

storage device and its associated HDM represented by block 1017, and the interface to an external disk drive and its associated ISM/HDM pair represented by block 1018. Separate HDM modules on each of the fiber channels interfaces to disks (01), (02), (03), and (04) manage the communication across the fiber channel arbitrated loops with the interfaces 1015 and 1016.

10

In the embodiment shown, the mirror module 1013 accesses disks (01), (02), and (04) as the primary, secondary and standby drives, respectively, for the mirror functions. Although the mirror module shown in FIG. 9 includes the tertiary drive interface, this tertiary drive is not used in the example system.

15

Contrary to the assertion in the Action, nothing in this text discloses (nor even suggests) specifying at least some of the plurality of physical disk drives for inclusion in a storage cell, as recited in claim 9. Therefore, the '669 patent

20   cannot anticipate independent claim 9.

Claim 9 further recites *as a separate element* "creating a storage cell object representing the storage cell wherein the physical store objects corresponding to the specified physical disk drives are included in the created storage cell." The Action asserts that the '669 patent discloses this limitation,

25   and generally cites column 8 and column 9 to support the rejection. Applicant disagrees. Nothing in this text discloses (or even suggests) creating a storage cell object representing the storage cell wherein the physical store objects corresponding to the specified physical disk drives are included in the created storage cell, as recited in claim 9. Therefore, the '669 patent cannot anticipate

30   independent claim 9.

Claims 10-16 depend from independent claim 9, and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 17-18

The '669 patent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) independent claim 17 because the '669 patent neither discloses (nor even suggests) limitations

5   explicitly recited in independent claim 17. Claim 17 recites "creating a logical disk object representing a virtual storage container, wherein the logical disk is an abstract representation of physical storage capacity provided by plurality of physical stores." The Action appears to assert that the LUN described in the '669 patent discloses this limitation, and cites column 16 and column 17 to

10   support the assertion.

Claim 17 further recites *as a separate element* "creating a virtual disk object comprising the logical disk object, the derived disk object and the presented disk object." The Action asserts that the '669 patent discloses this limitation, and generally cites tables 1 and 2, and columns 17-18 to support the

15   rejection. Applicant disagrees. Nothing in this text discloses (or even suggests) a virtual disk object that is *separate from a virtualized logical disk object*, much less a derived disk object and the presented disk object, as recited in claim 17. To the contrary, 1 and 2 appear to be routing tables, *not* virtualized logical disk objects. Therefore, the '669 patent cannot anticipate independent claim 17.

20   Claim 18 depend from independent claim 17, and is allowable at least by virtue of the dependency.

CONCLUSION

This application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application.

Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application,

5   the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the

unresolved issue.

                                        Respectfully Submitted,
                                        Jed W. Caven
10   Caven & Aghevli LLC
                                        9249 S. Broadway Blvd. #200-201
                                        Highlands Ranch, CO 80129

Dated: March 14, 2006

15   Jed W. Caven
                                        Caven & Aghevli LLC
                                        Reg. No. 40,551
                                        (720) 841-9544